

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/613,527	07/10/2000	Hiroaki Sudo	JEL 31211	9543
7590 11/12/2004		EXAMINER		
Stevens Davis Miller & Mosher LLP Suite 850			SEFCHECK, GREGORY B	
1615 L Street 1	٧W		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Washington, DC 20036			2662	

DATE MAILED: 11/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			ex
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/613,527	SUDO, HIROAKI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	-
	Gregory B Sefcheck	2662	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 23 September 2004 FAILS TO PLA Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this applic 1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper rep ch places the applic	oly to a cation in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) \square The period for reply expires $\underline{3}$ months from the mailing date of	f the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of	f the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the distatutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate ext the final Office action; or	ension fee under (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	ecause:		
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) \square they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or s	simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cance	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ns.
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed	d amendment
5.⊠ The a)□ affidavit, b)□ exhibit, or c)⊠ request for application in condition for allowance because: Set		sidered but does NC	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	re newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an

6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered beca raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s explanation of how the new or amended claims wou The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: _____. Claim(s) objected to: _____. Claim(s) rejected: 8-14. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 8. The drawing correction filed on ____ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner. 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 10.

☐ Other: See Continuation Sheet

JOHN PEZZL PRIMARY EXAMINER Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not convincing. The Examiner has reviewed all of the record and believes the rejections of claims 8-14 are proper. The prior art (fig. 2) in Miya, which discloses a pilot signal multiplexed into every chip, is understood to also disclose all other limitations of the pending claims.

Continuation of 10. Other: Examiner is including newly cited references on the attached PTO-892 form that also read on the pending claims but have not yet been cited for the record.